

**United States Department of the Interior  
Office of the Secretary**

---

**Report to the Director  
Office of Law Enforcement and Security**

---

**Security Assessment of the Jefferson National  
Expansion Memorial**



Assessment Dates: April 5 – 6, 2011

---

## Contents

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms	2
Report	
Executive Summary	3
Background	3
Scope and Methodology	4
Findings and Recommendations	5
Conclusions	12
Appendix 1	14

---

## List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

CCTV	Closed Circuit Television
DOI	Department of the Interior
EOD	Explosive Ordnance Detection
EECS	Electronic Entry Control System
IDS	Intrusion Detection Systems
HVAC	Heating, Ventilating and Air Conditioning Systems
JEFF	Jefferson National Expansion Memorial
JTTF	Joint Terrorism Task Force
NCI	National Critical Infrastructure
NPS	National Park Service
OIG	Office of Inspector General
OLES	Office of Law Enforcement and Security
PIV	Personal Identity Verification
SLMPD	St. Louis Police Metropolitan Department
UPS	Uninterrupted Power Supply

---

## Executive Summary

This report documents the findings of a security assessment conducted on the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial (JEFF) by the Department of the Interior (Department) Office of Law Enforcement and Security (OLES) in April, 2011.

This evaluation served to determine if the National Park Service (NPS) is in compliance with the overall requirements established in Department Manual (DM), Part 444 Chapter 2 (444DM2) entitled, “National Critical Infrastructure and Key Resource Security”. Generally speaking, 444DM2 sets forth the security requirements the Department deems minimally necessary to safeguard the National Critical Infrastructure and Key Resource assets it owns, operates and/or controls. These requirements are presented in five general categories; *Security Personnel*, *Perimeter Security*, *Access Control*, *Interior Security*, and *Security Planning*. Working directly with NPS personnel, the OLES evaluation focused on assessing the level of compliance within each of these five categories.

At its conclusion, the security assessment revealed that the National Park Service (b) (7)(E)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

## Background

As a result of Secretarial Law Enforcement Directive 14, the OLES was directed to develop a security policy oversight and compliance program. On April 7, 2006 the Department approved 444DM2, National Critical Infrastructure and Key Resource (CI/KR) Security. This chapter of the Departmental Manual (DM) provides the framework for conducting this and future security assessments at all National Monuments and Icons (NM&I's).

The Department has conducted several security reviews of JEFF since September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001. These included the National Monuments and Icons Assessment Methodology review that was conducted in August, 2004. This review was in response to the Department's role in the National Critical Infrastructure Protection Program under Homeland Security Presidential Directive – 7. This methodology rated the ability of the Arch to withstand specific attack scenarios. The review identified potential and real security deficiencies at the Arch. The methodology then discussed proposed enhancement strategies and associated costs that could be implemented to mitigate and/or correct the security deficiencies.

The second review was conducted in June, 2006. This review focused on the security deficiencies identified in the 2004 review, which still remained, and updated the costs for staffing, technology,

equipment to mitigate and/or correct deficiencies.

The third review was conducted in April, 2007, to determine if the security program at JEFF complied with the security minimums established in 444 DM 2.

---

***Photo No. 1 Jefferson National Expansion Memorial (JEFF)***



---

## **Scope and Methodology**

**Scope:** Directive 14 of the Secretary's law enforcement reforms<sup>1</sup> adopted the recommendations made by the Interior Office of Inspector General in 2002<sup>2</sup> and placed responsibility for DOI security policy oversight and compliance with OLES. By way of implementing this directive, OLES established a Security Division to provide guidance, oversight and support, and ensure compliance with Departmental security policies and procedures.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Law Enforcement at the Department of the Interior, Recommendations to the Secretary for Implementing Law Enforcement Reforms*, July 2002.

<sup>2</sup> See Inspector General's Report, *Disquieting State of Disorder: An Assessment of Department of the Interior law Enforcement*, (Report No. 2002-I-0014), January 2002.

In an effort to further implement Directive 14, OLES issued 444DM, Chapter 2, entitled, “National Critical Infrastructure and Key Resource Security.” 444DM2 establishes the security requirements deemed minimally necessary to safeguard National Critical Infrastructure and Key Resource assets owned and/or controlled by the Department and was developed in coordination with DOI bureaus and offices in response to the “The National Strategy for the Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets” (February 2003) and Homeland Security Presidential Directive-7 “Critical Infrastructure Identification, Prioritization, and Protection” (December 2003).

**Methodology:** During the period of April 6 – 7, 2011, the OLES Security Division conducted a security assessment of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial to assess the facility’s compliance with the security requirements established in 444DM2. Generally speaking, these requirements are presented in five categories; *Security Personnel*, *Perimeter Security*, *Access Control*, *Interior Security*, and *Security Planning*. The evaluation focused on assessing the level of compliance within each of these categories.

The evaluation process consisted of informal interviews and group discussions with NPS personnel; on site examination of facility infrastructure components, physical security systems, and operational procedures; and a review of relevant documentation to include prior risk assessments, Security Guard Post Orders, staffing models, security related standard operating procedures, and physical security infrastructure improvement contracts. Appendix 1 of this report lists evaluation participants.

---

## Findings and Recommendations

**Please Note:** In an effort to limit repetition in the narrative, where a specific minimum requirement was found to be applicable to more than one general category (b) (7)(E)

discussion of the requirement has been confined to a single category.

### Security Personnel

(b) (7)(E)



(b) (7)(E)



### Perimeter Security

(b) (7)(E)



---

*Photo No. 2 Barriers on Leonor K. Sullivan Boulevard at the base of the Grand Staircase*



---

(b) (7)(E)



---

**Photo No. 3 Vehicle Barrier on Memorial Drive adjacent the Old Cathedral**

---



---

(b) (7)(E) [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

(b) (7)(E)



Access Control Security

(b) (7)(E)



(b) (7)(E)



Interior Security

(b) (7)(E)



(b) (7)(E)

A series of eight horizontal black bars of varying lengths, representing redacted text.

---

---

Photo No. 4 (b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

A large rectangular area completely covered by a solid black redaction box.

---

(b) (7)(E)

A series of four horizontal black bars of varying lengths, representing redacted text.Two horizontal black bars of equal length, representing redacted text.

(b) (7)(E)



## Security Planning



(b) (7)(E)



---

## Conclusions

The security assessment found the NPS continues to have a strong security program at the JEFF and is generally in compliance with 444DM2. The systems in place to protect the ICON are effective and it is evident that a significant amount of time and funding have been expended to elevate the level of security. Many of the security enhancements put in place are the result of NPS leadership reviewing the previous security assessment and giving these recommendations funding priority. (b) (7)(E)



(b) (7)(E)



(b) (7)(E)

The OLES security assessment team commends the professionalism of the law enforcement and security staff. Assistant Chief Ranger (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) provided invaluable input into this assessment and displays the behavior of a dedicated law enforcement professional. The high level of physical security at the JEFF is a direct result of authorizing the hiring of a dedicated Physical Security Specialist position, which is a best practice for all Icons. In addition, the support and cooperation of the law enforcement and security programs by the JEFF senior leadership is apparent and should be commended.

One of the keys to a successful security program is the inclusion of security professionals in planning of projects for possible security enhancements. The OLES security assessment team was given the opportunity to review the draft plans for the redevelopment of the Arch Complex Visitors Center. This demonstrates the value that the JEFF senior leadership places in the law enforcement and security programs.

The Office of Law Enforcement and Security remains committed with the NPS to ensure that the appropriate level of security is in place at the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. In closing, the OLES review team would like to acknowledge the NPS management and the Law Enforcement and Security staff for their assistance in conducting this assessment.

## Assessment Participants

### Office of Law Enforcement and Security

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) - Supervisory Special Agent

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) Security Specialist

### National Park Service

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) – Assistant Chief Ranger

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) – Physical Security Specialist